

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

<u>M</u>

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,358	02/02/2004		Ronald S. Karr	VRT0133US	7650
60429 CSA LLP	7590 03/20/2007			EXAMINER	
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD. BLDG. 4, SUITE 201				YU, JAE UN	
AUSTIN, TX				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2185	
				MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
				03/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/770,358	KARR ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Jae U. Yu	2185

The MAN INC DATE of this communication conserve on the course beat with the correspondence address
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following
time periods:
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6,8-17 and 19-22</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>7 and 18</u> .
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
13. Other:
SANJIV SHAH

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding independent claim 1, the applicant argues that Sackelford does not disclose, "transmitting the first storage object description to a first computer system, and; transmitting the second storage object description to a second computer system". The applincant supports his/her argument by stating that Shackelford's virtual volumes do not include the mappings (Page 8, "Remarks").

However, the examiner does not consider the virtual volumes as "mapping storages". In fact, "the first storage object description" from the claim corresponds to the "mapping" of the pysical storage to virtual volumes (Paragraph 34) that is maintained within the "Secondary Storage Control" as "Virtualization Tables" 208 (Figure 2), whrerein the "Secondary Storage Control" corresponds to the "first computer system" from the claim.

Moreover, "the second object description" within the "second computer system" corresponds to "the replication management application" within the "system" (Figure 1), which identifies the secondary storage control as a copy of the primary storage control (Paragraph 34).

Examiner's Note: Claims 9 and 11 depend on claim 7. Claims 20 and 22 depend on claim 18. However, since claims 7 and 18 are cancelled, the examiner interprets that claims 9 and 11 depend on claim 6, and claim 20 and 22 depend on claim 17..